

adjacent to the base simultaneously with the heat-sealing of the upper open mouth.

### BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWINGS

Further characteristics and advantages of the invention will become better apparent from the detailed description of a preferred embodiment and of a method for performing it, which are given by way of non-limitative example and are illustrated in the accompanying drawings, wherein:

Figure 1 is a schematic view of a line for manufacturing the container according to the invention;

Figures 1a, 1b and 1c are three schematic side views of what is shown in Figure 1;

Figure 2 is a view of alternative steps of the manufacture of the container according to the invention;

Figures 2a, 2b and 2c are three side views of what is shown in Figure 2;

Figure 3 is a view of the container before the lower wings are folded;

Figure 4 is a view of the container with its wings folded and with its upper mouth heat-sealed.

### DESCRIPTION OF THE PREFERRED EMBODIMENTS

With reference to the figures, the container according to the invention is obtained starting from a sheet 10 made of heat-sealable plastic material which is unwound from a roll 11 and is heat-sealed along a longitudinal line 12 after folding said sheet.

In a subsequent step, shaped bars 13 kept at a temperature which allows the melting of the sheet 10 provide, in the region that will correspond to the base region of the container 14 being formed, lateral triangles 15 and a heat-sealed transverse region 16 which closes the base of the container.

Simultaneously with the heat-sealing of the base through the heat-sealed region 16, the upper mouth of the container 17 that has already been formed and filled, is closed by way of a transverse heat-seal 18, while separation of said container is achieved by means of a cropping operation 19 which

000001 000000 1000000

1/21/05  
ST.

<b>APPELLANT'S REPLY TO EXAMINER'S ANSWER 37 CFR §1.192</b>		Docket No. M1025/7004
Applicant:	Giorgio Trani and Marion Sterner	
Serial No:	09/678,008	
Filed:	October 3, 2000	
For:	CONTAINER WITH INHERENTLY STABLE BASE MADE OF FLEXIBLE MATERIAL AND METHOD FOR MANUFACTURING IT	
Examiner:	Sameh H. Tawfik	
Art Unit:	3721	

## CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.8(a)

The undersigned hereby certifies that this document is being placed in the United States mail with first-class postage attached, addressed to Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, Washington, DC 20231 on March 1, 2004.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Brenda A. Kantorski

Assistant Commissioner for Patents  
Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences  
Washington, D.C. 20231

This Reply Brief is in furtherance of the Notice of Appeal being filed concurrently herewith.

This Reply Brief is transmitted in triplicate.

**I. REPLY ARGUMENT (37 C.F.R. 1.192(c)(8))**

**Contrary to the Examiner's assertion, the cited Schneider reference does not teach the method claim elements of forming, folding, heat sealing and/or bonding of triangles and/or wings on the sides of a container laterally to a longitudinal seal or seam of the container.**

Claims 5 and 13 are the independent claims remaining in this application and on appeal. Both of these independent claims call for the method steps of forming, folding, bonding and/or heat-sealing of triangles and/or wings on the sides of a container laterally to a longitudinal seal that runs along the length of the container.

The examiner's Answer asserts that it is the examiner's belief that the Schneider reference (U.K. 1,115,636) discloses these steps based on the showing of an extension 22 from the bottom surface of the package shown in Figure 1 of the cited Schneider reference.

Applicants respectfully disagree.

Appellant's Brief 1 of 6

The Schneider reference does not disclose or suggest the forming of a triangle or wing, or the folding, bonding or heat-sealing of a wing lateral to the seam 20 shown in Schneider's Figure 1. The bottom platform 22 shown in Schneider's Figure 1 is not anywhere discussed in Schneider's written description as being folded or bonded to the side walls, 12, 14 of the package. To the contrary, it is suggested by Schneider's figures that this bottom formed platform 22 "protrudes" and "remains" as an extension of a flat base for Schneider's Fig. 1 package. This is consistently shown in all of Schneider's Figures that are pertinent to the Figure 1 embodiment, e.g. Figs. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9. No method step is discussed in Schneider's specification that would suggest that the "flat" base having the flat lateral extensions 22 should be folded up onto the sides 12, 14 of the package lateral to the longitudinal seam 20. The opposite seems to be suggested by the Schneider figures and written description, i.e. that the lateral extension should "remain" coplanar and flat together with the flat bottom surface of the package.

The method steps of independent claims 5 and 13 are clearly not anticipated by the Schneider reference. They are not inherently disclosed. They are not expressly disclosed. It is improper to read these steps into a prior art reference.

In order for a Section 102(b) anticipation to exist, the prior art reference must disclose all of the elements of the allegedly anticipated claims. Juicy Whip, Inc. v. Orange Bang, Inc., 63 U.S.P.Q.2d 1251, 292 F.3d 728 (Fed. Cir. 2002); Application of Marshall, 198 U.S.P.Q. 344, 578 F.2d 301 (C.C.P.A. 1978).

The claims in issue in this application are method claims. The standard for finding a Section 102(b) anticipation of a method claim is no less stringent than for an apparatus claim. In the Juicy Whip case for example, the Federal Circuit said:

When the asserted basis of invalidity is [Section 102(b) anticipation], the party with the burden of proof must show that "the subject of the barring activity met each of the limitations of the claim, and thus was an embodiment of the claimed invention." Scaltech Inc. v. Retec/Tetra, L.L.C., 178 F.3d 1378, 1383, 51 USPQ2d 1055, 1058 (Fed.Cir.1999).

\*\*\*\*\*

"Claim 6 is directed to a "method for inducing sales of a beverage" comprising the step of "positioning a transparent display bowl relative to the dispenser outlet to create the visual impression that said bowl is the reservoir and principal source from which a serving of the beverage is dispensed." '405 patent, col. 12, ll. 53-56. Claim 9 requires that the dispenser be "positioned relative to said outlet to create the visual impression that said container is the reservoir and principal source of said dispensed beverage issuing from said outlet." '405 patent, col. 13, ll. 10- 13. While the record contains testimony from several witnesses which, if believed by the jury, indicates that some of

Appellant's Brief 2 of 6

the claim limitations were found in the 1983 and 1988 dispensers, the record is devoid of evidence showing that the above limitations were found in either dispenser.

Similarly, in another method claim case, In Re Marshall, 198 U.S.P.Q. 344, 578 F.2d 301 (C.C.P.A. 1978), the appeals court (C.C.P.A.) stated:

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. s 102 are proper only when the claimed subject matter is identically disclosed or described in the prior art. In re Arkley, 455 F.2d 586, 587, 59 CCPA 804, 807, 172 USPQ 524, 526 (1972). In other words, to constitute an **anticipation**, all material elements recited in a claim must be found in one unit of prior art. Soundsciber Corp. v. United States, 360 F.2d 954, 960, 175 Ct.Cl. 644, 148 USPQ 298, 301 (1966).

\*\*\*\*\*

Applying this rule of law to the present case, we must reverse the board's rejection of claims 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. s 102 since the primary reference, the PDR, does not disclose every material element of the claimed subject matter. These **claims** are directed to a weight control **process**. Applicant uses an effective amount of the anesthetic, oxethazaine, to inhibit release of the pancreatic secretory hormones, secretin and pancreozymin, in order to control weight. The PDR, however, teaches using drugs containing the anesthetic oxethazaine to inhibit release of the acid-stimulating hormone, gastrin, in order to treat esophagitis, gastritis, peptic ulcer and irritable colon syndrome. Nothing in the PDR remotely suggests taking oxethazaine to lose weight

### CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, it is respectfully requested that the examiner's rejection of claims 5-13 of the present application be reversed and that the present application be allowed for issuance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

M. Lawrence Oliverio, Esq. Reg. No. 30,915  
KUDIRKA & JOBSE, LLP  
Customer Number 021127  
Tel: (617) 367-4600 Fax: (617) 367-4656

Appellant's Brief 3 of 6

**IX APPENDIX OF CLAIMS (37 C.F.R. 1.192(c)(9))**

The text of the claims involved in the appeal are:

- 1 5. A method for manufacturing an inherently stable container made of flexible material,  
2 comprising the following steps:
- 3 a) folding a continuous film of flexible material of appropriate width, to obtain a  
4 pouch having a longitudinal heat-seal and evenly spaced transverse heat-seals, followed by  
5 cropping the folded film in a direction transverse to the longitudinal heat seal;
- 6 b) heat-sealing in sides of the pouch, at a region of the transverse heat-seals,  
7 forming two triangles having wings laterally disposed relative to the longitudinal heat-seal;
- 8 c) punch opening said pouch, and optionally filling the pouch with a product;
- 9 d) folding and bonding the wings laterally relative to the longitudinal heat-seal and,  
10 after filling the pouch, simultaneously with the bonding of the wings, heat-sealing an upper open  
11 mouth of the pouch.
- 1 6. The method of claim 5, wherein in the first step the film is folded so as to form the pouch,  
2 which is closed longitudinally by heat-sealing overlapping flaps of said film, said heat-sealing  
3 being preferably located at a center of one of two flat faces of said pouch.
- 1 7. The method of claim 5, wherein a longitudinal dimension of the pouch is determined by  
2 way of transverse heat-seals.

1 8. The method of claim 6, wherein the heat-sealing of the triangles comprises heat-sealing  
2 of two overlapping sheets of flexible material that constitute said pouch so as to form at the  
3 base, said two triangles with vertex wedging inside said pouch.

1 9. The method of claim 5, further comprising forming ribs during the step for forming the  
2 heat-sealed triangles, said ribs being adapted to facilitate, by guided deformation, opening of  
3 the pouch at filling.

1 10. The method of claim 9, wherein during filling of the pouch with product a substantially flat  
2 -base forms, while said wings formed due to the heat-sealed triangles protrude laterally beyond  
3 said base.

1 11. The method of claim 10, wherein following said filling step said wings are folded toward  
2 the container and are retained thereon.

1 12. The method of claim 5, comprising insertion of the heat-sealed triangles inside the  
2 container by way of pushing means which push said triangles from the outside inward.

1 13. A method for manufacturing an inherently stable container made of flexible material,  
2 comprising the steps of:

3 a) folding a continuous film of flexible material of appropriate width, to obtain a  
4 pouch having a longitudinal heat-seal and evenly spaced transverse heat-seals, followed by  
5 cropping the folded film in a direction transverse of the longitudinal heat-seal ;

6 b) heat-sealing two triangles having wings into sides of the pouch lateral to the  
7 longitudinal heat-seal, each of the triangles having a base which coincides with one edge of the

Appellant's Brief 5 of 6

- 8 pouch and a vertex which wedges inwards said pouch lateral to the longitudinal heat-seal punch
- 9 opening said pouch, and optionally filling the pouch with a product folding and bonding the
- 10 wings onto the triangles.